

WMCT Charge

Scenarios:

CT run the following Scenarios:

Scenario 1:

A. Early Stage 1

B. Late Stage 1

Baseline: Accord + DOI b(2)

800 TAF devoted to the Accord and b(2) fish protection actions.

All assets to Water Users except benefits from flexing standards. Determine the additional water needed to meet WS and WQ goals.

Scenario 2:

Early Stage 1

Baseline: Accord + DOI b(2)

Game Fisheries as we did before (as needed). Fish have Accord and b(2) fish protection actions. EWA and Water Users share additional assets. Balance WS and WQ.

Scenario 3:

Late Stage 1

Baseline: Accord + DOI b(2)

Game Fisheries "biological bar" for full "assurances". EWA and Water users share assets. Balance WS and WQ

Scenario 4:

Early Stage 1

Baseline: Accord + DOI b(2)

Game Fisheries "biological bar" for full "assurances". EWA and Water Users share assets. Balance WS and WQ

At the DT meeting on the 26th CT, present in clear simple terms a progress report on:

- 1) What scenarios the CT is running, i.e. what is the fundamental purpose of each run? What information will be presented to the DT as a result of their evaluation of the scenarios (not just a number).
- 2) Use graphic as much as possible to describe who is affected geographically such as the westside is affected by the Accord, b(2), etc.
- 3) Post process Trinity to see, as if a demand had to be met, how much bigger the deficit is.

Hypothesis

Need a peer review of the "biological bar". Are we moving towards recovery? What is a reasonable bar for the start of Stage 1? How do we get at non-biological benefits? What are biological tradeoffs between water and no-water based benefits?

Need workplan on how we would get this review ASAP.